

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejection raised in the Office action, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any portion of the Office Action not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office action, the Office noted that claims 1-6 and 8-10 are pending and rejected. Applicants amend claims 1 and 6. Applicants have not introduced any new matter by way of the foregoing amendments.

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance.

REJECTION

The Office rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants amend the claims to remedy the anomaly. Thus, Applicants submit that all pending claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph and respectfully request that claims 1-5 be reconsidered and rejection withdrawn.

The Office also rejected claims 1-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,225,322 ("*Folmsbee*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,544 ("*Lee*").

Folmsbee discloses a key that "has two separate functions which must be coded into the key when it is produced." *Folmsbee* at Col. 16, lines 33, 34, and that the "satellites must broadcast the same cryptographic keys to many set-top boxes simultaneously." *Id.*, at 49-51. *Lee*, on the other hand, is devoid from disclosing either one of these required limitations.

Accordingly, it is Applicant's opinion that *Lee* and *Folmsbee*, alone and in combination, do not suggest or show a motivation for modifying the reference or to combine the reference teachings. In addition, it is Applicant's opinion that there is no evidence in any of the prior art that shows a "reasonable expectation of success" in

combining the references. Thus, it is Applicant's belief that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been provided.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Office believes that any unresolved issues still exist or if, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite passing the present application to issue, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney directly at 972-917-4365 or the office of the undersigned attorney at 972-917-5352 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 15, 2010

By: /MIRNA ABYAD/
MIRNA ABYAD
Registration No. 58,615
Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Telephone: (972) 917-4365
E-mail: mabyad@ti.com